



Davies, A. S., Kim, D., Park, J., Lee, J-Y., Vang, H., Pickering, A. E., & Oh, S. B. (2019). Hedonic drinking engages a supra-spinal inhibition of thermal nociception in adult rats. *PAIN*, 160(5), 1059-1069.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001482>

Peer reviewed version

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001482](https://doi.org/10.1097/j.pain.0000000000001482)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Wolters Kluwer at
https://journals.lww.com/pain/Fulltext/2019/05000/Hedonic_drinking_engages_a_supraspinal_inhibition.9.aspx .
Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Hedonic drinking engages a supra-spinal inhibition of thermal nociception in adult rats

Alexander J Davies^{1,5*}, Doyun Kim^{1,2*}, Jeongrak Park², Jeong-Yun Lee², Hue Vang¹, Anthony E Pickering^{3,4#}, Seog Bae Oh^{1,2#}.

¹ Dental Research Institute and Department of Neurobiology and Physiology, School of Dentistry, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea.

² Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, College of Natural Sciences, Seoul National University, Republic of Korea.

³ School of Physiology, Pharmacology & Neuroscience, Medical Sciences Building, University of Bristol, United Kingdom.

⁴ Anaesthesia, Pain & Critical Care Sciences, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, Bristol Royal Infirmary, University of Bristol, United Kingdom.

⁵ Nuffield Department of Clinical Neuroscience, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford University, United Kingdom (current address).

* These authors contributed equally.

#Correspondance should be addressed to:

- Seog Bae Oh, D.D.S., Ph.D. Department of Brain and Cognitive Sciences, College of Natural Sciences, Seoul National University, 101 Daehak-ro, Jongno-gu, Seoul 03080, Republic of Korea. Email: odolbae@snu.ac.kr, Tel: +82 (0)2 740 8656.
- Anthony E. Pickering, B.Sc., Ph.D., M.B., Ch.B., F.R.C.A. School of Physiology, Pharmacology and Neuroscience, Medical Sciences Building, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 1TD, United Kingdom. E-mail: Tony.Pickering@Bristol.ac.uk, Tel: +44 (0) 117 331 2311.

Number of pages: 40

Number of figures: 7

Introduction

Aversion to pain and attraction to reward are strong motivators of behavior across species [12]. The rewarding nature of pain relief [56] suggests that stimuli or contexts of opposing valence may in fact lie along a continuum [51] but the neural circuits responsible for this reciprocal processing are poorly understood [16]. Consistent with this theory reward may conversely impart analgesia. It is believed that the calming effect of giving sugar (sucrose in solution) to human infants is a direct example of the phenomenon of pain reduction by reward [59] and it is empirically applied in paediatrics [36]. A recent systematic review concluded that sucrose may offer a reduction in procedural pain in new born infants [68]; however, there is limited evidence of a direct modulation of nociceptive processing at either the spinal or cortical level [66]. Thus the role of sucrose as a bona fide analgesic in human infants remains in question until more is known about the underlying neurobiology [28].

A sucrose-analgesia phenomenon has also been demonstrated in neonatal rats [14], which at least in part, survives mid-collicular decerebration [6], can be reversed by an opioid receptor antagonist [14], and reduces Fos-like immunoreactivity in the spinal cord [61] suggesting the involvement of endogenous descending inhibitory opioidergic signalling. In adults sucrose remains a strong motivator to feed, even in potentially hazardous circumstances [30]. However, the relative contributions of descending inhibition of nociceptive input versus more cognitively driven analgesia remains unknown and could provide clues to how these circuits are disrupted in chronic pain [56].

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 We have developed a simple and reliable model of sucrose drinking-induced analgesia
9
10 in adult Sprague-Dawley rats using the Hargreaves' test of hind paw thermal sensitivity
11
12 as a nociceptive assay. We used this assay to characterise the analgesic phenomenon
13
14 and the context in which it appears. Specifically, we compared previous findings in
15
16 neonatal animals [5, 15, 61], by examining the potential role of endogenous analgesia
17
18 mediated by opioid and catecholaminergic neurotransmitters at the spinal level via
19
20 descending inhibition. We further tested the requirement of expectation and learned
21
22 experience [26] by the substitution of sucrose for water in hypovolaemic and euvolaemic
23
24 animals. Finally, to examine the requirement for appetitive motivation in the analgesic
25
26 effect of sucrose as a reward [31] we compared the effect of voluntary sucrose drinking
27
28 with passive administration via an intraoral cannula.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Our results reveal an acute, potent and robust inhibitory effect of sucrose drinking on
38
39 thermal nociceptive behavior. Unlike sucrose-analgesia in neonates the phenomenon is
40
41 independent of endogenous opioid signalling and does not operate via classical
42
43 descending catecholaminergic inhibition of the spinal cord circuitry. Experience of
44
45 sucrose drinking had a conditioning effect sufficient to elicit a short-lasting placebo-like
46
47 analgesia by water drinking alone in euvolaemic animals. In chronically cannulated
48
49 animals sugar analgesia only appeared after repeated conditioning by oral perfusion,
50
51 and was completely prevented systemic dosing with the cannabinoid CB1 receptor
52
53 antagonist rimonabant. These results suggest that rewarding drinking recruits an
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 endogenous analgesic circuit that is dependent on supra-spinal endocannabinoid
6
7 signalling.
8
9

10 **Methods**

11 **Animals**

12
13
14 All experiments and procedures were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and
15 Use Committee at Seoul National University (SNU-151113-2) and are reported here in
16
17 accordance with the ARRIVE guidelines [48]. Male and female Sprague-Dawley rats
18
19 were purchased from Orient Bio (Charles River, Korea) aged 5 weeks and habituated
20
21 for one week prior to experiments. Animals were maintained in an air conditioned clean
22
23 facility ($22 \pm 2^{\circ}\text{C}$, $50 \pm 10\%$ humidity) and provided standard lab chow and water *ad*
24
25 *libitum*, except when food or water was removed for deprivation experiments for the
26
27 duration indicated. Behavioral testing was performed between the hours of 09.00-17.00.
28
29 At the end of experiments animals were killed by rising concentration of CO₂ in
30
31 accordance with Schedule 1 of the UK Home Office Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act
32
33 1986.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **Thermal withdrawal latency testing (Hargreaves' test)**

45
46 Hind paw thermal withdrawal latencies were tested using a thermal plantar analgesia
47
48 instrument (Ugo Basile, Italy). After habituation on the glass plate, when rats were
49
50 resting but not sleeping, the infrared stimulator (50% intensity) was applied to the
51
52 middle area of hind paw. Thermal stimuli applied during voluntary drinking were started
53
54 1-2 s after the commencement of imbibing. A positive response was determined by a
55
56 rapid flinch or lifting of the paw away from the stimulus. The stimulus was repeated 4
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 times on each paw with an interval of at least 2 min and the time taken to withdraw was
6
7 averaged per paw, per rat. A cut-off time was set at 20 s to prevent tissue damage. For
8
9 examination of spinal c-fos immunoreactivity after Hargreaves' testing a manually
10
11 controlled thermal stimulator was used (Plantar Analgesia Meter, IITC Life Science,
12
13 USA) to deliver repetitive stimuli of 10 s duration.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 **Drinking task training**

21
22 Training was performed daily, typically between the hours of 09.00 and 13.00. Rats
23
24 were habituated in individual test cages (30 – 60 min) on an absorbent mat which was
25
26 removed prior to testing. Animals were provided with 10-20 ml of either a sucrose
27
28 solution (10% in water) or sucralose (0.017% in water) in a plastic tray with access via
29
30 an aperture (40 mm diameter) in the cage via a removable door (Figure 1A). At the
31
32 commencement of drinking, a period of 30 s access was allowed before the door was
33
34 closed. After a refractory period of 5 – 10 mins rats were allowed three more access
35
36 periods (four trials in total). Training was deemed complete when animals spent more
37
38 than 10 s drinking during any given 30 s access period (typically within 5 sessions).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Local inflammation model**

47
48 Under brief isoflurane anaesthesia, rats received an intraplantar injection of complete
49
50 Freund's adjuvant (CFA, 50 µg) in one paw (left or right). CFA was prepared as a 2:1
51
52 emulsion in sterile saline. Rats received a subcutaneous injection of CFA as a 75 µl
53
54 bolus using an insulin syringe with a 26 gauge needle. 24 h after injection all animals
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 were re-tested for thermal withdrawal latency before (resting) and during sucrose
6
7 drinking.
8
9

10 11 12 **Intra-oral cannulation** 13

14
15 Cannula were implanted using a variation on previous methods [34, 38]. For acute
16
17 cannulation [34], under isoflurane anesthesia, a curved 20G needle and 32 mm catheter
18
19 (3S Cath, Dukwoo Medical) was inserted intraorally through the buccal mucosa just
20
21 rostral to the lower first molar on the right side. The needle and catheter was passed
22
23 subcutaneously over the masseter muscle and between the right eye and ear to emerge
24
25 on the back of the head between the ears. The needle was then removed and 20 cm of
26
27 PE10 tubing (16 µl dead space volume) was passed through the catheter, which was
28
29 then also removed leaving the tubing in place. A 3-4mm length of PE50 tube was
30
31 fashioned into a flanged end and fitted to the oral end of the tubing via cyanoacrylate
32
33 glue. The flanged end was pulled into the mouth to rest flush on the inner cheek. The
34
35 protruding end was secured with a silk suture to the back of the head. Rats were
36
37 recovered for at least one hour after cannulation before testing.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 For chronic cannulation [38] in sucrose trained animals, an 18-gauge syringe needle
48
49 was inserted between the scapulae and passed subcutaneously towards the intra-oral
50
51 site (buccal mucosa just rostral to the lower first molar on the right side). An intra-oral
52
53 catheter made of PE90 tubing with one end heat-flared to form a 2 mm-diameter flange
54
55 was inserted from the intra-oral site and externalized between the shoulders. The
56
57 needle was removed, and 1 cm of silicone tubing (0.058" ID × 0.077" OD) was sleeved
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

and glued with silastic medical adhesive silicone (Dow Corning) to fix the PE90 tubing. Rats were recovered for 5 days prior to oral perfusion experiments.

Intra-oral perfusion

Cannulated animals were placed in the testing chamber for 30 mins to habituate. The open end of cannula tubing was fixed to the top of the cage and fitted to an automatic syringe pump via a 40 cm length of PE50 tubing and 25G needle. 5 ml syringes and tubing were pre-loaded with water, sucrose (10%) solution or air (sham). In all perfusion experiments thermal stimulation began 10 s after the start of oral perfusion as indicated by masticatory movement of the rat jaw in the case of water and sucrose solution. Each paw was tested twice and average latencies plotted per animal. A 20 s flush with water was performed to remove traces of the previous solution between each trial. For repetitive sucrose experience in chronically cannulated rats, all animals were given a delivery of water, sucrose (10%) solution, or air (sham) in a random order, repeated 5 times in daily sessions for 5 consecutive days

Intrathecal (lumbar spinal cord) cannulation

Intrathecal cannulation was performed in accordance with previously published methods [39]. All surgical tools, solutions and catheter materials were sterilized beforehand by autoclave or ethylene oxide (EO) gas, respectively. Animals were weighed and given a prophylactic dose of the antibiotic enrofloxacin (5mg/kg) subcutaneously prior to surgery. Under isoflurane anaesthesia the lower lumbar and mid-scapulae areas of the back were shaved and wiped with iodine solution. A small midline incision was made (1-

2cm long) and a 24 gauge catheter needle was inserted at a 45 degree angle between the 5th and 6th lumbar vertebrae. Correct placement of the needle into the vertebral canal is indicated by a slight twitch of the tail [54]. A 32 gauge intrathecal cannula with stylet (ReCathCo) was inserted into the intrathecal space by slowly advancing the cannula rostrally (6 cm). The catheter stylet was then removed and the cannula attached to length of PE10 tubing (10 cm) by cyanoacrylate glue and attached to the muscle fascia with 7-0 silk. The lumbar incision was closed with 2-3 skin clips. The PE10 tubing was passed under the back skin and exited the incision between the scapulae. Here the tubing was connected to a back-mounted pedestal system (with 6 mm side connector) (Plastics One) via a short length (1.5 cm) of thick-walled PE50 tubing, again fixed with cyanoacrylate glue. The pedestal mesh was attached to the underlying muscle fascia with 6-0 sutures and the wound around the pedestal closed with 4-0 silk sutures. The cannula system was filled with 20 µl of sterile saline to maintain patency during recovery (3-4 days). Incision sites were treated with iodine and rats were returned to warmed individual cages for recovery. Successful cannula placement was confirmed after experiments by reversible bilateral hind-limb paralysis after intrathecal administration of 2% lidocaine (20 µl), and cresyl violet dye (20 µl) labelling of lumbar spinal cord at post-mortem. Out of 12 sucrose-trained animals that underwent intrathecal catheterization, patency was maintained in seven animals which had the lumbar position of the catheter confirmed for behavioral analysis.

Intrathecal injection

Drug or vehicle-only solutions were back-loaded into a loading cannula connected to a 50 µl Hamilton syringe (with 23G needle) on an automatic syringe pump (KD Science). Drugs or vehicle solutions were delivered as a 10 µl bolus followed by 18.6 µl flush with sterile saline given at 10 µl/min. After injection the connector was removed and the back pedestal cannula was fitted with a dust-cap. Animals were then immediately returned to the testing cage for thermal sensory testing.

Drug treatments

Naloxone HCl (Sigma) was prepared as a stock (50 mg/ml) in distilled water and diluted in 0.9% saline vehicle before systemic (1 mg/kg, i.p.) [26, 53] or spinal (10 µg, i.t.) [69] administration. Yohimbine HCl (Tocris) was prepared as a stock (10 mg/ml) in DMSO and diluted in 0.9 saline (30% DMSO vehicle) for spinal (30 µg, i.t.) [39] administration. S-sulpiride HCl (Sigma) was prepared as a stock (30 mg/ml) in DMSO and diluted in saline (10% DMSO vehicle) for systemic (10 mg/kg, i.p.) [9] administration. The CB1 receptor antagonist, rimonabant (SR141716A) (Tocris) was prepared as a stock in DMSO and diluted in a vehicle containing 2% tween-80 and 20% DMSO in 0.9% saline [45] for systemic administration (5 mg/kg, i.p.) [37, 73]. Sensory testing was performed 10-15 mins after systemic and spinal injections and completed within 45 min of drug treatment. The same animals underwent alternative treatment of drug or vehicle solutions separated by at least one rest day. Spinal drug treatments were followed by a 20 µl saline flush. All testing was performed blind to the treatment.

Spinal c-fos assessment

Sucrose-trained male SD rats received thermal stimulation (IITC Life Sciences, Plantar test) to their right hind paw of a set duration (10 s) repeated 15 times at an interval of 1-2 mins, either during sucrose drinking (n=6) or while resting (control, n=6). 2 h after the final heat stimulation animals received a lethal dose of sodium pentobarbital (>60 mg/kg, i.p.) and were transcardially perfused sequentially with PBS (0.01 M) followed by paraformaldehyde (4% in PBS). c-fos immuno-labelling was performed according to previously published methods [8]. The lumbar spinal cord was removed for post-fixation overnight and cryopreserved in 30% sucrose for 3-4 weeks at 4°C. Spinal tissue blocks were embedded in OCT compound (Leica) and free-floating spinal cord sections (50 µm) were cut on a cryostat followed by immunolabelling with an anti-c-fos (Ab-5) (4-17) rabbit polyclonal antibody (1:10,000, Calbiochem) and visualised using DAB staining technique (Vector Laboratories) before mounting on gelatin-coated glass slides. Images were acquired on a light microscope and analysed for the number of c-fos-like immunoreactive nuclei per section (four sections per animal) using the “analyse particles” function on ImageJ (NIH). Image thresholding prior to particle analysis was performed by an experimenter blinded to the treatment group. Two out of 12 animals (one sucrose, one control) were removed from analysis due to poor tissue fixation.

Statistics

Comparisons before and after sucrose drinking were made with paired t test. Comparisons between three or more groups of time points were made with repeat measures one-way ANOVA followed by Bonferroni post-test for multiple comparisons.

Two-way ANOVA was used for comparison of the effect of drug treatment on thermal withdrawal latencies before and during sucrose drinking. All tests are two-sided. Behavioral data were obtained by an observer blind to the treatment group. Analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism version 5.00 for Windows, GraphPad Software, San Diego California USA, www.graphpad.com. Data are presented as mean \pm standard error of the mean unless otherwise stated. $p < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

Results

In an initial study we fasted 6-8 week old rats by removing access to chow overnight (12-16 h) and placed them in a testing apparatus with access to a sucrose solution via a closable aperture (Figure 1A, B). Thermal withdrawal latencies were not different after the transient fasting compared to the pre-fasting control. Subsequent consumption of a solution of 10% sucrose in water (equivalent to the typical sugar content found in soft drinks and fruit juices [75]) increased the thermal withdrawal latency from 10.9 ± 0.8 s to 14.8 ± 0.6 s ($p < 0.001$, repeat measures One-way ANOVA, $n = 6$ rats) (Figure 1C).

To mitigate the confounds of fasting in rats, such as metabolic stress and polyuria causing dehydration [55], we adopted a training schedule of sucrose drinking (see Methods). Prior to training, non-fasted animals displayed a long and variable latency to drink, taking an average of 72 ± 23 s ($n = 12$) once given access to the sucrose solution. After several days of training, however, rats readily drank the sucrose solution upon access, with the average time taken to drink significantly reduced to less than 2 s by the sixth training session (Figure 2A). Trained rats consistently displayed an increase in withdrawal latency while drinking sucrose (10.7 ± 0.5 s) compared to resting baseline (8.6 ± 0.3 s, $p = 0.0002$, paired t test, $n = 12$ rats) (Figure 2B). Rats were often observed to continue consuming sucrose after withdrawal of the hind paw from the thermal stimulus, at which point the access window was closed. The sucrose effect was transient and the withdrawal latency returned to baseline when tested 1-2 min later. We also found the same phenomenon in female rats, showing that they were also capable of being trained to drink sucrose, with the average time to drink decreasing from 158 ± 23 s to 34 ± 7 s

1
2
3
4
5 by the fifth training session (n=12 rats, Repeat measures One-way ANOVA: F(4,
6 44)=5.175, p=0.0017. Dunnett's post -test: Session 1 vs 5, t=3.806, **p<0.01), and paw
7
8 withdrawals increasing from 10.3 ± 0.3 s at rest to 12.6 ± 0.3 s during sucrose drinking
9
10 (n=12 rats, paired t test: t=8.919, p<0.0001)
11
12
13
14

15
16
17 In a subsequent session, male sucrose-trained rats were given access to the drinking
18 area but not provided with any solution. In this experiment animals showed the same
19 movement to the window, inserting their head through the aperture, but displayed no
20 consistent change to their withdrawal latency (p=0.1247, paired t-test, t=1.662; n=12
21 rats) compared to rest (Figure 2C), suggesting that contextual expectancy alone is not
22 sufficient for the analgesic response to a sweet reward. In a separate experiment rats
23 were trained to consume the non-nutritive sweetener sucralose (0.017% w/v in water) at
24 a concentration equivalent to the sweetness of 10% sucrose (1:600) [76]. Withdrawal
25 latencies recorded during sucralose drinking were also elevated (11.1 ± 0.7 s;
26 p=0.0162, n=12 rats, paired t-test) compared to prior resting values (9.3 ± 0.5 s) (Figure
27 2D). There was no difference in the percentage change in withdrawal latency during
28 sucrose ($125 \pm 4\%$ of resting) or sucralose drinking ($120 \pm 7\%$ of resting) (p=0.5676,
29 unpaired t-test, t=2.074; n=12 rats per group). These results indicate that sweet
30 substances do not need calorific value to produce analgesia.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53
54 Next we asked whether sucrose-drinking analgesia persisted in rats in an already
55 sensitised state. At baseline, prior to sensitisation with the inflammatory reagent
56 complete Freund's adjuvant (CFA), rats displayed analgesia in both paws tested during
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 sucrose drinking (Figures 3A and 3B). A single bolus of CFA (50 µg) given
6
7 subcutaneously to the plantar surface of the hind paw resulted, 24 h later, in a
8
9 significant reduction in withdrawal latency in the injected (ipsilateral) paw, indicative of
10
11 inflammatory hyperalgesia (Figure 3A). After CFA treatment, subsequent drinking of
12
13 sucrose solution still produced an increase in withdrawal latency by an equivalent
14
15 degree to that seen before sensitisation (Figure 3A), suggesting a potent analgesic
16
17 mechanism capable of partially reversing inflammatory hypersensitivity. The effect of
18
19 sucrose on the withdrawal latency in the untreated contralateral paw was also
20
21 preserved, albeit at a slightly reduced magnitude (though not significantly) at Day 2
22
23 compared to Day 0 (Figure 3B), likely due to the increased weight-bearing on the
24
25 uninflamed paw. These results complement previous findings in neonates [61] and
26
27 suggest that the sucrose analgesia phenomenon in adults is sufficient to attenuate
28
29 responses from hypersensitive thermal afferents.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 Sucrose-analgesia in neonates has been shown to be an opioid receptor-dependent
40
41 phenomenon [5, 14]. However, pre-treatment with the opioid receptor antagonist
42
43 naloxone at a dose shown to block both endogenous and exogenous opioid analgesia
44
45 in rats (1 mg/kg, i.p.) [26, 53] (Figure 4A) or given directly to the spinal cord (10 µg, i.t.)
46
47 [69] (Figure 4B), did not block the analgesia induced by sucrose drinking.
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Dopaminergic and noradrenergic neurotransmitter systems are involved in directing
55
56 behavior towards sweet reward [17, 62] and are both capable of mediating analgesia via
57
58 descending inhibitory signalling [42]. For example, consumption of sugar leads to the
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 release of dopamine in the striatum, a critical component of the brain's reward system
6
7 and a driver of hedonic behavior even in the face of unpleasant stimuli [71]. In the spinal
8
9 cord dopamine produces thermal analgesia via D2-like receptors [43, 70], therefore we
10
11 treated rats systemically with the D2-like receptor antagonist sulpiride at 10 mg/kg, a
12
13 dose sufficient to prevent analgesia induced by spinal administration of the
14
15 dopaminergic agonist apomorphine [9]. The dopamine receptor antagonist did not alter
16
17 sucrose analgesia (Figure 4C).
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 The actions of noradrenaline on $\alpha 2$ -adrenoceptors to inhibit spinal nociception are well
26
27 characterised [57, 67]. Sweet reward also increases the activity of noradrenergic locus
28
29 coeruleus (LC) neurons, helping to direct attention to reward by releasing noradrenaline
30
31 in the prefrontal cortex [17]. Conversely chemical ablation of LC projections dramatically
32
33 reduces voluntary sucrose intake [4]. LC neurons are also among the brainstem nuclei
34
35 to have been implicated in the phenomenon of sucrose analgesia in neonates [6, 49].
36
37 As systemic administration of $\alpha 2$ antagonists can have confounding autonomic and
38
39 sedating side effects, we targeted the spinal cord directly with intrathecal injection of 30
40
41 μ g yohimbine, a dose sufficient to block endogenous noradrenergic spinal analgesia
42
43 [39]. However, intrathecal yohimbine also had no effect upon sucrose analgesia (Figure
44
45
46
47 4D). Together these results suggest that these descending catecholaminergic pathways
48
49 are unlikely to be involved in the analgesic response to sucrose.
50
51
52
53
54
55

56
57 To examine whether sucrose drinking is inhibiting nociception at the spinal level (by
58
59 another mechanism) we performed immuno-labelling for c-fos in the spinal cord as a
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 measure of activity in nociceptive circuits [40]. Animals received repetitive thermal
6
7 stimulation to one hind paw either at rest or during concurrent sessions of sucrose
8
9 drinking. Spinal cords were fixed 2 h after the final stimulation and processed for c-fos-
10
11 like immuno-reactivity. The pattern of c-fos-like immunolabelling in the medial region of
12
13 the superficial dorsal horn of the lumbar spinal cord with the repetitive stimulation
14
15 protocol (10 s thermal stimulation repeated once per minute for 15 minutes) was
16
17 consistent with previous observations of hind paw thermal stimulation [18, 77] and
18
19 confirmed activation of the spinal nociceptive circuitry (Figures 5A and B, Control). We
20
21 also observed a small number of positive nuclei in the neck region of the deep dorsal
22
23 horn, corresponding to laminae V-VI of the spinal cord. No c-fos-like reactivity could be
24
25 discerned in the contralateral dorsal horn or ipsilateral ventral horn. Animals which
26
27 drank sucrose during each thermal stimulation also showed similar pattern of c-fos
28
29 expression in the spinal cord (Figure 5A), and quantification of c-fos-like immuno-
30
31 reactivity showed no difference between groups in either superficial or deeper laminae
32
33 of the spinal dorsal horn (Figure 5B). This result suggests that sucrose drinking does
34
35 not significantly alter the activity in nociceptive circuits at a spinal level.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Next, we asked whether sweet taste was required for the analgesic effect by providing
48
49 motivation to drink water instead of a sucrose solution. Rats deprived of water for 24 h
50
51 readily drank water upon its presentation and this also produced an increase in
52
53 withdrawal latency (Figure 6A), while water fasting alone had no effect on baseline
54
55 latency (Figure 6A). By presenting water instead of sucrose to sucrose-trained rats we
56
57 were able to examine the effect of water drinking in euvoletic animals. In this context
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 water drinking alone was sufficient to increase withdrawal latency (Figure 6B). Animals
6
7 trained to drink non-nutritive sucralose also displayed a significant increase in mean
8
9 withdrawal latency from 8.5 ± 0.5 s to 12.3 ± 0.9 s ($p=0.0026$, paired t-test, $t=4.112$;
10
11 $n=10$ rats) when presented with water instead of sucralose. A trial-to-trial comparison of
12
13 drinking performance during the four repeat thermal stimulations per session revealed
14
15 that the total time spent drinking water decreased progressively compared to sucrose
16
17 over the same number of trials (Figure 6C), though was still sufficient to elicit analgesia
18
19 equivalent to sucrose over the four trials tested (Two-Way repeat measures ANOVA:
20
21 sucrose v water: $F(1,66)=0.05$, $p=0.8317$, $n=12$ rats). This suggested that the
22
23 conditioning effect of sucrose driving water drinking in euvoaemic animals rapidly
24
25 extinguishes after repeated water exposure. Systemic treatment with naloxone had no
26
27 effect on the acute analgesia induced by sucrose-conditioned water drinking,
28
29 suggesting it was not mediated by endogenous opioidergic mechanisms (Figure 6D).
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The opioid-independent nature of the analgesic response evoked by sucrose-
40
41 conditioned water drinking, and it's rapid extinction are characteristic of non-opioid
42
43 placebo analgesia [3, 22], which is thought to be mediated by cannabinoid CB1
44
45 receptors [10]. We therefore investigated the potential role of endocannabinoid
46
47 signalling using the well-characterised CB1 antagonist rimonabant (SR141716A).
48
49 Consistent with the role of CB1 receptors in controlling appetite [7, 24] systemic
50
51 treatment with rimonabant at (5 mg/kg i.p.) in sucrose-trained rats led to a dramatic
52
53 increase in the time taken to start drinking sucrose compared to vehicle (Figure 7A)
54
55
56
57
58
59 animals receiving rimonabant showed little interest in the drinking access window and
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 latency times were not significantly different from pre-training values ($p=0.5550$,
6
7 unpaired t test; $t=0.6088$, $n=7$ rats). Therefore to bypass the suppressive effect of CB1
8
9 antagonism on voluntary sucrose drinking we applied solutions directly to the oral cavity
10
11 via an intraoral catheter [34, 38]. Administration of 20 μ l sucrose solution intraorally
12
13 elicited tongue and mouth movements in the animals without spillage indicative of
14
15 tasting and active ingestion [34]. However, passive administration of sucrose solution in
16
17 naïve animals was not sufficient to elicit thermal analgesia in rats compared with water
18
19 perfusion or 'sham' dry running of the peristaltic pump as controls (Figure 7B),
20
21 consistent with the reported loss of passive sucrose analgesia in development (>3
22
23 weeks old rats) [5].
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 This raised the question of whether the analgesic effect of oral sucrose requires prior
33
34 experience of sucrose drinking. To address this question rats had chronic intraoral
35
36 cannulation after sucrose drinking training. In the first session after recovery from
37
38 cannulation we again saw no effect of oral sucrose perfusion compared to water or
39
40 sham (air only) (Figure 7C). Interestingly, with repeated exposure via the oral cannula
41
42 rats continued to consume sucrose (Movie 1) but in contrast allowed water to drip from
43
44 their mouth (Movie 2), suggesting that a preference for sucrose had developed and that
45
46 as a consequence water consumption was being avoided in these animals. By the fifth
47
48 repeat session of oral perfusion we observed a significant increase in withdrawal
49
50 latency during sucrose perfusion (Figure 7D). In these animals, withdrawal latencies
51
52 were consistently elevated during sucrose perfusion compared to water (Figure 7E).
53
54 Under these conditions, pre-treatment with the CB1 antagonist rimonabant completely
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 blocked the analgesic effect of sucrose (Figure 7F). Together, these results suggested
6
7
8 that taste experience alone is not sufficient to reveal the analgesic effect of sucrose
9
10 drinking. Instead, the development of a preference for sucrose after repeated exposure
11
12 appears to engage an analgesic mechanism via endogenous activation of cannabinoid
13
14
15 CB1 receptors.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Discussion

We found that sucrose drinking in trained adult rats produces a robust and reproducible thermal analgesia which was sufficiently potent to oppose inflammatory thermal hyperalgesia. The magnitude of the analgesic effect was similar to that previously seen in neonates [61] and was seen in female as well as male animals. The analgesic effect was reproducible on repeated testing over hours and days and was temporally aligned to the periods of drinking behavior, consistent with previous reports of ingestive analgesia [29]. The effect extended to sucralose and to water (if fluid deprived or when consumption was conditioned by previous sucrose experience) indicating the analgesia was seen with hedonic drinking rather than simply nutritive or hydrative consumption [31].

The main central projection of the gustatory nerves is to the nucleus of the solitary tract (NTS) [35], which in turn sends projections to the parabrachial (PB) nucleus [21]. Indeed, Fos-like immuno-reactivity is induced in the NTS and PB by analgesic sucrose consumption [6]. Direct electrical stimulation of the NTS produces analgesia in rats [52] and this has been linked to the release of beta-endorphin within the brainstem to produce an opioidergic analgesia [19]. The NTS and PB also make extensive connections to the key trimverate of this descending system namely the periaqueductal gray (PAG), locus coeruleus (LC) and the rostro-ventral medulla (RMV) [58]. We therefore reasoned that targeting the opioidergic neurotransmitter system may modulate the analgesic effect of sucrose. However, treatment with naloxone (either spinally or systemically) failed to prevent the change in paw withdrawal latency observed during

1
2
3
4
5 sucrose drinking. Additionally, pre-treatment with D2-like receptor and α 2-adrenergic
6
7 receptors antagonist at doses sufficient to block spinal analgesia by dopaminergic [9]
8
9 and noradrenergic agonists [39] also had no effect on the analgesic response of
10
11 sucrose drinking. Furthermore, the number of Fos-like nuclei in either the superficial or
12
13 deep lamina of the spinal cord were not different between sucrose-fed and control
14
15 groups, suggesting that sucrose analgesia is achieved without affecting either the input
16
17 of noxious stimuli to the spinal cord [1] or interneuron circuits that drive the spinal
18
19 reflexes [44]. Together these data suggest that the neonatal phenomenon [5, 15, 61]
20
21 and the adult behavioral paradigm reported here are engaging distinct neural circuitry.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 A form of naloxone-sensitive sucrose analgesia has been reported in adult rats using
31
32 the tail flick assay [23]. In our study we used the Hargreaves' model of thermal
33
34 nociception. Unlike the tail flick response, which is preserved in spinalized rats [41] the
35
36 behavioral response to thermal stimulation of the hind paw (hot plate; Hargreaves) is
37
38 thought to engage supra-spinal processing [20]. The latency of both the tail flick (a
39
40 spinal reflex) and hot plate response are increased by stimulation of the PAG and RVM
41
42 [42]. However, while the analgesic effect of RVM stimulation on the tail flick response
43
44 can be inhibited by spinal administration of either opioidergic or monoaminergic
45
46 antagonists, none of these treatments applied spinally antagonised the effect of RVM
47
48 stimulation on the hot plate response [42] suggesting that such brainstem nuclei are
49
50 indeed capable of mediating a form of analgesia without engagement of the descending
51
52 spinal projections.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Water is a strong motivator in water-deprived rats [63]. In our study water consumption
9
10 by hypovolaemic rats also increased paw withdrawal latencies. Like sucrose in satiated
11
12 rats, this observation is consistent with the potential role of reward pathways in the
13
14 analgesic effect. Euvolaemic rats, as expected, were not motivated to drink water.
15
16 However, by presenting water to rats after voluntary sucrose or sucralose training, we
17
18 were not only able to motivate euvolaemic animals to drink water, but also to mimic the
19
20 analgesic effect of both substances, suggesting that caloric consumption is not required
21
22 and that brain pathways related to the expectation of gustatory reward [71] are sufficient
23
24 for the analgesic effect.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 The effect of water consumption when presented to an animal expecting sugar reward
33
34 is consistent with the definition of placebo analgesia [74]. In our study, the analgesic
35
36 response evoked by sucrose-conditioned water drinking was not blocked by naloxone
37
38 which suggested that this paradigm may be an example of non-opioid placebo
39
40 analgesia [3]. Interestingly, over the course of the four trials we recorded progressively
41
42 shorter drinking times for water than for sucrose in sucrose-trained animals, such that
43
44 by the fifth trial rats did not drink water and therefore could not be tested further. This
45
46 apparent extinction of the effect is again consistent with a placebo-like response [22].
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 The neuropharmacology of placebo responses are thought to differ depending on the
55
56 context of the conditioning paradigm, with expectation-evoked placebo driven by
57
58 endogenous opioids and conditioning-evoked placebo driven by other specific
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

transmitter systems [3]. In one of the original descriptions of sweet-substance analgesia by Dum & Herz it was shown that naloxone-sensitive analgesia could be elicited by expectation of sweet reward alone. [26]. In our paradigm we observed that simply expectation of reward in the absence of consumption was not sufficient to increase withdrawal latencies. This result could be due to the lack of a distinct conditioning cue, which in the case of a learned reward response is necessary to engage attentional circuits in the brain stem [17]. The opioid-dependency of sucrose analgesia may therefore depend on differences in the past learning experience of sucrose consumption [3].

The similarity with the characteristics of non-opioid placebo analgesia [3, 22] led us to investigate the possible contribution of cannabinoid CB1 receptors [10] to the sucrose analgesia phenomenon. Treatment with the CB1 receptor antagonist rimonabant significantly reduced the motivation of the animals to drink sucrose, consistent with the known suppressive effect of the drug on the consumption of palatable foods [7, 65]. Therefore, in order to test the effect of the drug on withdrawal latencies during sucrose drinking we switched to a system of direct perfusion via an intraoral cannula. In contrast to previous studies in neonatal animals [5, 15, 61], passive intraoral administration of sucrose solution alone did not affect withdrawal latencies in naïve animals, nor when animals had previously been trained to voluntarily drink sucrose. Instead, the sucrose analgesia phenomenon was revealed by repeated exposure via the intraoral cannula which resulted in a clear preference for sucrose compared to water perfusion. This suggests that rather than simply taste experience, there is a requirement for the

1
2
3
4
5 development of a conscious preference for sucrose drinking in a specific context in
6
7 order to endow the passively administered sucrose with sufficient hedonic value to elicit
8
9 analgesia [31, 60].
10
11
12
13
14

15 It is possible that the revelation of the analgesic phenomenon by repeated sucrose
16
17 exposure also represents the diminishment of an aversive component over time, which
18
19 may otherwise mask an innate reward-analgesia by sucrose [16]. Conversely, the
20
21 extinction of conditioned voluntary water consumption, and the failure to ingest orally
22
23 perfused water could represent the *development* of an aversion to the previously neutral
24
25 water in parallel to the learned preference for sucrose. Given the positive association
26
27 between the preference for sweet drinks and the frequency of their consumption [33]
28
29 our findings have implications for strategies to reduce the consumption of sugar-
30
31 sweetened beverages, particularly in young children and adolescents [27].
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 We found that CB1 receptors play a critical role in the context of sucrose-conditioned
40
41 analgesia. The neural pathway underlying this effect remains unknown but we may find
42
43 clues in the role of endocannabinoids in food intake [24]. Feeding during satiety (a mark
44
45 of hedonic consumption) has been linked to CB1 receptor signalling in both the
46
47 hypothalamus [50] and PBN [25]. As a site of convergence of gustatory [21] and
48
49 hypothalamic [2] pathways, and an important relay for spinal projection neurons [11],
50
51 the PBN is well placed to modulate ascending nociceptive signalling by hedonic
52
53 consumption. Interestingly, hypothalamic projections to the PBN have recently been
54
55 shown to be sufficient to elicit analgesia during hunger [2]. We may speculate that
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 endocannabinoid signalling in the hypothalamic-PBN pathway could be sufficient for
6
7
8 sucrose analgesia; however, important questions remain as to how this pathway could
9
10 be specifically activated after learned sucrose–conditioning.
11
12
13
14

15 In humans, evidence of an analgesic-like response to oral sucrose is consistently
16
17 observed in newborns [68, 72], while reports in adults are mixed [13, 46, 60]. The
18
19 distinction between the supra-spinal analgesia we have observed here in the adult rat,
20
21 and the descending spinal analgesia reported in neonatal animals [5, 15, 26], could help
22
23 to explain some of the discrepancy. Intriguingly, the analgesic effect of oral glucose
24
25 administration in newborns undergoing a minor procedure was not blocked by
26
27 intravenous naloxone [32]. This raises the question of whether in fact the opioid-
28
29 independent, supra-spinal analgesia we have observed in adult rats has more in
30
31 common with human newborns, which also lack observable spinal nociceptive
32
33 modulation during sucrose analgesia [66]. The prospect of sucrose mediating a
34
35 placebo-like phenomenon also raises important ethical questions for the use of sucrose
36
37 as an analgesic in newborn infants [28]. Further knowledge of the neural circuits
38
39 involved will help not only inform the use of sucrose as an analgesic on the pediatric
40
41 wards [66, 68], but also the neurological drivers of hedonic overconsumption leading to
42
43 addiction and obesity [47] and their relationship to chronic pain [64].
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Acknowledgements

We thank Prof Hidemasa Furue for early guidance on this project, and Prof Youngnam Kang and Dr Elizabeth Mooney for helpful feedback and discussion. This work was supported by a Korea-UK R&D Collaboration Project grant (HI15C3077) to S.B.O., A.E.P. and A.J.D. from the Korea Health Industry Development Institute (KHIDI).

Conflict of interest statement

All authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- [1] Abbadie C, Taylor BK, Peterson MA, Basbaum AI. Differential contribution of the two phases of the formalin test to the pattern of c-fos expression in the rat spinal cord: studies with remifentanyl and lidocaine. *Pain* 1997. 69(1-2): 101-10.
- [2] Alhadeff AL, Su Z, Hernandez E, Klima ML, Phillips SZ, Holland RA, Guo C, Hantman AW, De Jonghe BC, Betley JN. A Neural Circuit for the Suppression of Pain by a Competing Need State. *Cell* 2018. 173(1): 140-152 e15.
- [3] Amanzio M, Benedetti F. Neuropharmacological dissection of placebo analgesia: expectation-activated opioid systems versus conditioning-activated specific subsystems. *J Neurosci* 1999. 19(1): 484-94.
- [4] Ammar AA, Sodersten P, Johnson AE. Locus coeruleus noradrenergic lesions attenuate intraoral intake. *Neuroreport* 2001. 12(14): 3095-9.
- [5] Anseloni VC, Weng HR, Terayama R, Letizia D, Davis BJ, Ren K, Dubner R, Ennis M. Age-dependency of analgesia elicited by intraoral sucrose in acute and persistent pain models. *Pain* 2002. 97(1-2): 93-103.
- [6] Anseloni VC, Ren K, Dubner R, Ennis M. A brainstem substrate for analgesia elicited by intraoral sucrose. *Neuroscience* 2005. 133(1): 231-43.
- [7] Arnone M, Maruani J, Chaperon F, Thiebot MH, Poncelet M, Soubrie P, Le Fur G. Selective inhibition of sucrose and ethanol intake by SR 141716, an antagonist of central cannabinoid (CB1) receptors. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)* 1997. 132(1): 104-6.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 [8] Badral B, Davies AJ, Kim YH, Ahn JS, Hong SD, Chung G, Kim JS, Oh SB. Pain
7 fiber anesthetic reduces brainstem Fos after tooth extraction. J Dent Res 2013.
8 92(11): 1005-10.
9
10
11
12 [9] Barasi S, Duggal KN. The effect of local and systemic application of
13 dopaminergic agents on tail flick latency in the rat. European journal of
14 pharmacology 1985. 117(3): 287-94.
15
16
17
18
19 [10] Benedetti F, Amanzio M, Rosato R, Blanchard C. Nonopioid placebo analgesia is
20 mediated by CB1 cannabinoid receptors. Nat Med 2011. 17(10): 1228-30.
21
22
23
24 [11] Bernard JF, Dallel R, Raboisson P, Villanueva L, Le Bars D. Organization of the
25 efferent projections from the spinal cervical enlargement to the parabrachial area
26 and periaqueductal gray: a PHA-L study in the rat. J Comp Neurol 1995. 353(4):
27 480-505.
28
29
30
31
32
33 [12] Berridge KC. Pleasures of the brain. Brain Cogn 2003. 52(1): 106-28.
34
35
36 [13] Bhattacharjee M, Mathur R. Antinociceptive effect of sucrose ingestion in the
37 human. Indian J Physiol Pharmacol 2005. 49(4): 383-94.
38
39
40
41 [14] Blass E, Fitzgerald E, Kehoe P. Interactions between sucrose, pain and isolation
42 distress. Pharmacology, biochemistry, and behavior 1987. 26(3): 483-9.
43
44
45 [15] Blass EM, Fitzgerald E. Milk-induced analgesia and comforting in 10-day-old
46 rats: opioid mediation. Pharmacology, biochemistry, and behavior 1988. 29(1):
47 9-13.
48
49
50
51
52
53 [16] Borsook D, Becerra L, Carlezon WA, Jr., Shaw M, Renshaw P, Elman I, Levine
54 J. Reward-aversion circuitry in analgesia and pain: implications for psychiatric
55 disorders. Eur J Pain 2007. 11(1): 7-20.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 [17] Bouret S, Sara SJ. Reward expectation, orientation of attention and locus
7
8 coeruleus-medial frontal cortex interplay during learning. *The European journal of*
9
10 *neuroscience* 2004. 20(3): 791-802.
11
12 [18] Bullitt E, Lee CL, Light AR, Willcockson H. The effect of stimulus duration on
13
14 noxious-stimulus induced c-fos expression in the rodent spinal cord. *Brain*
15
16 *research* 1992. 580(1-2): 172-9.
17
18 [19] Cerritelli S, Hirschberg S, Hill R, Balthasar N, Pickering AE. Activation of
19
20 Brainstem Pro-opiomelanocortin Neurons Produces Opioidergic Analgesia,
21
22 Bradycardia and Bradypnoea. *PLoS One* 2016. 11(4): e0153187.
23
24 [20] Chapman CR, Casey KL, Dubner R, Foley KM, Gracely RH, Reading AE. Pain
25
26 measurement: an overview. *Pain* 1985. 22(1): 1-31.
27
28 [21] Cho YK, Li CS, Smith DV. Gustatory projections from the nucleus of the solitary
29
30 tract to the parabrachial nuclei in the hamster. *Chem Senses* 2002. 27(1): 81-90.
31
32 [22] Colloca L, Petrovic P, Wager TD, Ingvar M, Benedetti F. How the number of
33
34 learning trials affects placebo and nocebo responses. *Pain* 2010. 151(2): 430-9.
35
36 [23] de Freitas RL, Kubler JM, Elias-Filho DH, Coimbra NC. Antinociception induced
37
38 by acute oral administration of sweet substance in young and adult rodents: the
39
40 role of endogenous opioid peptides chemical mediators and mu(1)-opioid
41
42 receptors. *Pharmacology, biochemistry, and behavior* 2012. 101(2): 265-70.
43
44 [24] Di Marzo V, Matias I. Endocannabinoid control of food intake and energy
45
46 balance. *Nature neuroscience* 2005. 8(5): 585-9.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 [25] Dipatrizio NV, Simansky KJ. Inhibiting parabrachial fatty acid amide hydrolase
7 activity selectively increases the intake of palatable food via cannabinoid CB1
8 receptors. *Am J Physiol Regul Integr Comp Physiol* 2008. 295(5): R1409-14.
9
10
11
12 [26] Dum J, Herz A. Endorphinergic modulation of neural reward systems indicated
13 by behavioral changes. *Pharmacology, biochemistry, and behavior* 1984. 21(2):
14 259-66.
15
16
17 [27] Eck KM, Dinesen A, Garcia E, Delaney CL, Famodu OA, Olfert MD, Byrd-
18 Bredbenner C, Shelnutt KP. "Your Body Feels Better When You Drink Water":
19 Parent and School-Age Children's Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Cognitions.
20 *Nutrients* 2018. 10(9).
21
22
23 [28] Fitzgerald M. What do we really know about newborn infant pain? *Exp Physiol*
24 2015. 100(12): 1451-7.
25
26
27 [29] Foo H, Mason P. Sensory suppression during feeding. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*
28 2005. 102(46): 16865-9.
29
30
31 [30] Foo H, Crabtree K, Thrasher A, Mason P. Eating is a protected behavior even in
32 the face of persistent pain in male rats. *Physiol Behav* 2009. 97(3-4): 426-9.
33
34
35 [31] Foo H, Mason P. Analgesia accompanying food consumption requires ingestion
36 of hedonic foods. *J Neurosci* 2009. 29(41): 13053-62.
37
38
39 [32] Gradin M, Schollin J. The role of endogenous opioids in mediating pain reduction
40 by orally administered glucose among newborns. *Pediatrics* 2005. 115(4): 1004-
41 7.
42
43
44 [33] Grimm GC, Harnack L, Story M. Factors associated with soft drink consumption
45 in school-aged children. *J Am Diet Assoc* 2004. 104(8): 1244-9.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 [34] Hall WG. The ontogeny of feeding in rats: I. Ingestive and behavioral responses
7 to oral infusions. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology* 1979.
8 93(6): 977-1000.
9
10
11
12 [35] Hamilton RB, Norgren R. Central projections of gustatory nerves in the rat. *J*
13 *Comp Neurol* 1984. 222(4): 560-77.
14
15
16 [36] Harrison D, Beggs S, Stevens B. Sucrose for procedural pain management in
17 infants. *Pediatrics* 2012. 130(5): 918-25.
18
19
20
21 [37] Hohmann AG, Suplita RL, Bolton NM, Neely MH, Fegley D, Mangieri R, Krey JF,
22 Walker JM, Holmes PV, Crystal JD, Duranti A, Tontini A, Mor M, Tarzia G,
23 Piomelli D. An endocannabinoid mechanism for stress-induced analgesia. *Nature*
24 2005. 435(7045): 1108-12.
25
26
27
28
29 [38] Houpt TA, Berlin R. Rapid, labile, and protein synthesis-independent short-term
30 memory in conditioned taste aversion. *Learn Mem* 1999. 6(1): 37-46.
31
32
33 [39] Hughes SW, Hickey L, Hulse RP, Lumb BM, Pickering AE. Endogenous
34 analgesic action of the pontospinal noradrenergic system spatially restricts and
35 temporally delays the progression of neuropathic pain following tibial nerve injury.
36 *Pain* 2013. 154(9): 1680-90.
37
38
39 [40] Hunt SP, Pini A, Evan G. Induction of c-fos-like protein in spinal cord neurons
40 following sensory stimulation. *Nature* 1987. 328(6131): 632-4.
41
42
43 [41] Irwin S, Houde RW, Bennett DR, Hendershot LC, Seevers MH. The effects of
44 morphine methadone and meperidine on some reflex responses of spinal
45 animals to nociceptive stimulation. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 1951. 101(2): 132-43.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 [42] Jensen TS, Yaksh TL. Spinal monoamine and opiate systems partly mediate the
7
8 antinociceptive effects produced by glutamate at brainstem sites. Brain research
9
10 1984. 321(2): 287-97.
11
12 [43] Jensen TS, Yaksh TL. Effects of an intrathecal dopamine agonist, apomorphine,
13
14 on thermal and chemical evoked noxious responses in rats. Brain research 1984.
15
16 296(2): 285-93.
17
18 [44] Jinks SL, Antognini JF, Martin JT, Jung S, Carstens E, Atherley R. Isoflurane, but
19
20 not halothane, depresses c-fos expression in rat spinal cord at concentrations
21
22 that suppress reflex movement after supramaximal noxious stimulation. Anesth
23
24 Analg 2002. 95(6): 1622-8.
25
26 [45] Johanek LM, Heitmiller DR, Turner M, Nader N, Hodges J, Simone DA.
27
28 Cannabinoids attenuate capsaicin-evoked hyperalgesia through spinal and
29
30 peripheral mechanisms. Pain 2001. 93(3): 303-15.
31
32 [46] Kakeda T, Ishikawa T. Gender differences in pain modulation by a sweet
33
34 stimulus in adults: A randomized study. Nurs Health Sci 2011. 13(1): 34-40.
35
36 [47] Kenny PJ. Reward mechanisms in obesity: new insights and future directions.
37
38 Neuron 2011. 69(4): 664-79.
39
40 [48] Kilkenny C, Browne WJ, Cuthill IC, Emerson M, Altman DG. Improving
41
42 bioscience research reporting: The ARRIVE guidelines for reporting animal
43
44 research. J Pharmacol Pharmacother 2010. 1(2): 94-9.
45
46 [49] Kishi R, Bongiovanni R, de Nadai TR, Freitas RL, de Oliveira R, Ferreira CM,
47
48 Coimbra NC. Dorsal raphe nucleus and locus coeruleus neural networks and the
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5 elaboration of the sweet-substance-induced antinociception. *Neuroscience letters*
6
7
8 2006. 395(1): 12-7.
9
- [50] Koch M, Varela L, Kim JG, Kim JD, Hernandez-Nuno F, Simonds SE, Castorena
10
11 CM, Vianna CR, Elmquist JK, Morozov YM, Rakic P, Bechmann I, Cowley MA,
12
13 Szigeti-Buck K, Dietrich MO, Gao XB, Diano S, Horvath TL. Hypothalamic POMC
14
15 neurons promote cannabinoid-induced feeding. *Nature* 2015. 519(7541): 45-50.
16
17
18
19
- [51] Leknes S, Tracey I. Pleasures of the brain: Masters of Mankind, in *Pleasures of*
20
21 *the brain: The neural basis of sensory rewards*, M.L. Kringelbach and K.C.
22
23 Berridge, Editors. 2010, Oxford University Press: New York. pp. 320-335.
24
25
26
- [52] Lewis JW, Baldrighi G, Akil H. A possible interface between autonomic function
27
28 and pain control: opioid analgesia and the nucleus tractus solitarius. *Brain*
29
30 *research* 1987. 424(1): 65-70.
31
32
33
- [53] Markowitz R, Jacobson J, Bain G, Kornetsky C. Naloxone blockade of morphine
34
35 analgesia: a dose-effect study of duration and magnitude. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther*
36
37 1976. 199(2): 385-8.
38
39
40
- [54] Mestre C, Pelissier T, Fialip J, Wilcox G, Eschalier A. A method to perform direct
41
42 transcutaneous intrathecal injection in rats. *Journal of pharmacological and*
43
44 *toxicological methods* 1994. 32(4): 197-200.
45
46
47
48
- [55] Morrison SD, Mackay C, Hurlbrink E, Wier JK, Nick MS, Millar FK. The water
49
50 exchange and polyuria of rats deprived of food. *Quarterly Journal of*
51
52 *Experimental Physiology and Cognate Medical Sciences* 1967. 52(1): 51-67.
53
54
55
- [56] Navratilova E, Porreca F. Reward and motivation in pain and pain relief. *Nature*
56
57 *neuroscience* 2014. 17(10): 1304-12.
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 [57] North RA, Yoshimura M. The actions of noradrenaline on neurones of the rat
7 substantia gelatinosa in vitro. *The Journal of physiology* 1984. 349: 43-55.
8
9
10 [58] Ossipov MH, Morimura K, Porreca F. Descending pain modulation and
11 chronification of pain. *Curr Opin Support Palliat Care* 2014. 8(2): 143-51.
12
13
14
15 [59] Pasek TA, Huber JM. Hospitalized infants who hurt: a sweet solution with oral
16 sucrose. *Crit Care Nurse* 2012. 32(1): 61-9.
17
18
19
20 [60] Pepino MY, Mennella JA. Sucrose-induced analgesia is related to sweet
21 preferences in children but not adults. *Pain* 2005. 119(1-3): 210-8.
22
23
24
25 [61] Ren K, Blass EM, Zhou Q, Dubner R. Suckling and sucrose ingestion suppress
26 persistent hyperalgesia and spinal Fos expression after forepaw inflammation in
27 infant rats. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1997. 94(4): 1471-5.
28
29
30
31
32 [62] Roitman MF, Stuber GD, Phillips PE, Wightman RM, Carelli RM. Dopamine
33 operates as a subsecond modulator of food seeking. *J Neurosci* 2004. 24(6):
34 1265-71.
35
36
37
38
39 [63] Rolls BJ, Jones BP, Fallows DJ. A comparison of the motivational properties of
40 thirst induced by intracranial angiotensin and by water deprivation. *Physiol Behav*
41 1972. 9(5): 777-82.
42
43
44
45
46 [64] Sim LA, Lebow J, Weiss K, Harrison T, Bruce B. Eating Disorders in Adolescents
47 With Chronic Pain. *J Pediatr Health Care* 2017. 31(1): 67-74.
48
49
50
51 [65] Simiand J, Keane M, Keane PE, Soubrie P. SR 141716, a CB1 cannabinoid
52 receptor antagonist, selectively reduces sweet food intake in marmoset. *Behav*
53 *Pharmacol* 1998. 9(2): 179-81.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4
5
6 [66] Slater R, Cornelissen L, Fabrizi L, Patten D, Yoxen J, Worley A, Boyd S, Meek J,
7
8 Fitzgerald M. Oral sucrose as an analgesic drug for procedural pain in newborn
9
10 infants: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2010. 376(9748): 1225-32.
11
12
13 [67] Sonohata M, Furue H, Katafuchi T, Yasaka T, Doi A, Kumamoto E, Yoshimura
14
15 M. Actions of noradrenaline on substantia gelatinosa neurones in the rat spinal
16
17 cord revealed by in vivo patch recording. *The Journal of physiology* 2004. 555(Pt
18
19 2): 515-26.
20
21
22 [68] Stevens B, Yamada J, Ohlsson A, Haliburton S, Shorkey A. Sucrose for
23
24 analgesia in newborn infants undergoing painful procedures. *Cochrane Database*
25
26 *Syst Rev* 2016. 7: CD001069.
27
28
29 [69] Takano Y, Takano M, Sato I, Yaksh TL. Effects of spinal naloxone and
30
31 naltrindole on the antinociceptive action of intrathecally administered
32
33 dexmedetomidine. *Journal of anesthesia* 1996. 10(3): 194-8.
34
35
36 [70] Tamae A, Nakatsuka T, Koga K, Kato G, Furue H, Katafuchi T, Yoshimura M.
37
38 Direct inhibition of substantia gelatinosa neurones in the rat spinal cord by
39
40 activation of dopamine D2-like receptors. *The Journal of physiology* 2005. 568(Pt
41
42 1): 243-53.
43
44
45 [71] Tellez LA, Han W, Zhang X, Ferreira TL, Perez IO, Shammah-Lagnado SJ, van
46
47 den Pol AN, de Araujo IE. Separate circuitries encode the hedonic and nutritional
48
49 values of sugar. *Nature neuroscience* 2016. 19(3): 465-70.
50
51
52
53 [72] Thakkar P, Arora K, Goyal K, Das RR, Javadekar B, Aiyer S, Panigrahi SK. To
54
55 evaluate and compare the efficacy of combined sucrose and non-nutritive
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

sucking for analgesia in newborns undergoing minor painful procedure: a randomized controlled trial. J Perinatol 2016. 36(1): 67-70.

- [73] Thanos PK, Dimitrakakis ES, Rice O, Gifford A, Volkow ND. Ethanol self-administration and ethanol conditioned place preference are reduced in mice lacking cannabinoid CB1 receptors. Behav Brain Res 2005. 164(2): 206-13.
- [74] Tracey I. Getting the pain you expect: mechanisms of placebo, nocebo and reappraisal effects in humans. Nat Med 2010. 16(11): 1277-83.
- [75] Ventura EE, Davis JN, Goran MI. Sugar content of popular sweetened beverages based on objective laboratory analysis: focus on fructose content. Obesity (Silver Spring) 2011. 19(4): 868-74.
- [76] Wiet SG, Beyts PK. Sensory Characteristics of Sucralose and other High Intensity Sweeteners. Journal of Food Science 1992. 57(4): 1014-1019.
- [77] Williams S, Evan GI, Hunt SP. Changing patterns of c-fos induction in spinal neurons following thermal cutaneous stimulation in the rat. Neuroscience 1990. 36(1): 73-81.

Figure Captions

Figure 1.

Active consumption of sucrose (10%) solution in fasted rats increases hind paw withdrawal latency to heat. **(A)** Reward drinking and hind paw thermal sensory testing apparatus. **(B)** Naïve rats were food deprived overnight (16h) before being offered a sucrose (10%) solution through a window in the testing chamber. **(C)** Thermal sensitivity was tested at rest before and after fasting, and re-tested on commencement of drinking with sucrose solution. Heat stimulus was applied to the right hind paw four times (during separate trials) and the average latency plotted. Bars represent mean \pm SEM. Repeat measures one-way ANOVA $F(2,15)=26.00$, $n=6$, $p=0.0001$; Bonferroni post-test, *** $p<0.001$. *ns*, not significant.

Figure 2.

Training reveals analgesic effect during active sucrose drinking in non-fasted rats. **(A)** Time to drink reward from window opening. Rats were trained in daily sessions to drink 10% sucrose solution provided through window (30s access periods, 4 repeat trials per session, 6-8 session repeats). Session 3, not determined. Bars represent mean \pm SEM. One way repeat measures ANOVA, $F(4,44)=7.571$ with Dunnett's multiple comparisons to session 1, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<0.001$. **(B)** Non-fasted, sucrose trained rats. Withdrawal latency at rest and during sucrose drinking. $n=12$ rats, Paired Student's *t*-test. **(C)** Thermal withdrawal latency at rest and during access to the solution reservoir in the absence of sucrose solution. $n=12$ rats, paired Student's *t*-test. **(D)** Rats trained to drink

sucralose (0.017% w/v). Withdrawal latency at rest and during sucralose drinking. n=12 rats, paired Student's t-test. The large, filled data points in B-D represent mean values \pm SEM.

Figure 3.

Sucrose drinking attenuates thermal hypersensitivity after local inflammation. The analgesic effect of sucrose drinking on heat withdrawal latencies on both paws was checked on all animals in a pre-test session (Day 0) and again on Day 2. On Day 1 all rats received an intraplantar injection of complete Freund's adjuvant (CFA, 50 μ g, 2:1 emulsion in sterile saline, arrow) in one paw (ipsilateral). **(A)** Thermal sensitivity in CFA inflamed (ipsilateral) hind paw. Absolute withdrawal latencies over time (left). Repeat measures One-way ANOVA: $F(3,27)=111.3$, $p<0.0001$ with Bonferroni post-test, $*p<0.05$, $***p<0.001$ (n=10 rats). Percentage change in latency (right). Paired t-test, $p=0.6846$. **(B)** Thermal sensitivity in untreated (contralateral) hind paw. Absolute withdrawal latencies over time (left). Repeat measures One-way ANOVA: $F(3,27)=44.46$, $p<0.0001$ with Bonferroni post-test, $***p<0.001$ (n=10 rats). *ns*, not significant. Percentage change in latency (right). Paired t-test, $p=0.0554$.

Figure 4.

Sucrose drinking analgesia is not prevented by systemic or spinal naloxone, systemic dopamine D2-like receptor or spinal α 2-adrenergic receptor blockade. **(A)** 8-10 week male SD rats treated with naloxone (1 mg/kg) or vehicle (saline) i.p. 10 min before Hargreaves' testing. Two way ANOVA: Effect of naloxone $F(1,10)=1.62$ $p=0.2321$.

Effect of sucrose $F(1,10)=39.63$, $p<0.0001$; Bonferonni post-test, $*p<0.05$, $***p<0.001$.
(B) Spinal treatment with naloxone (10 μ g) or vehicle (saline) i.t. 10 min before thermal latency testing. Two way ANOVA: Effect of naloxone $F(1,9)=0.54$ $p=0.4799$. Effect of sucrose $F(1,10)=98.74$, $p<0.0001$; Bonferonni post-test, $***p<0.001$. **(C)** 8-10 week male SD rats treated with sulpiride (10 mg/kg) or vehicle (10% DMSO in saline) i.p. 10 min before thermal latency testing. Two way ANOVA: Effect of sulpiride $F(1,10)=0.05$ $p=0.8215$. Effect of sucrose $F(1,10)=22.15$, $p=0.0008$; Bonferonni post-test, $*p<0.05$, $**p<0.001$. **(D)** Spinal treatment with yohimbine (30 μ g) or vehicle (30% DMSO in saline) i.t. 10 min before thermal latency testing. Two way ANOVA: Effect of yohimbine $F(1,11)=1.91$ $p=0.1948$. Effect of sucrose $F(1,11)=20.19$, $p=0.0009$; Bonferonni post-test, $*p<0.05$, $**p<0.01$.

Figure 5.

Sucrose consumption does not affect expression of spinal c-fos during thermal stimulation of the hind paw. **(A)** c-fos-like immunoreactivity in the ipsilateral dorsal horn of the lumbar L4-6 spinal cord in control (*above*) and sucrose fed (*below*) male rats after repeated hind paw thermal stimulation. Note dark stained nuclei in the dorso-medial region of the superficial lamina (outlined by white dashed line) and neck region of the deep lamina. **(B)** Quantification of c-fos-like nuclei in control and sucrose-fed groups. Two-way ANOVA. Effect of sucrose: $F(1,16)=0.01$, $p=0.9084$; $n=4$ sections per rat, 5 rats per group. *ns*, not significant.

Figure 6.

Water drinking by water-deprived or sucrose-expectant rats increases paw withdrawal latency to heat. **(A)** Naïve rats were Hargreaves' tested before and after water deprivation (24h) at rest, and again at the commencement of drinking sucrose (10%) solution. Repeat measures one way ANOVA: $F(2, 15)=49.48$, $p<0.0001$. Bonferroni post-test: $***p<0.001$. **(B)** Unlike naïve animals, previously sucrose-trained rats drank water, increasing withdrawal latency. Paired Student's t -test. **(C)** Total licking time declines during water drinking in sucrose-conditioned rats compared to sucrose drinking. Two-way ANOVA: Sucrose versus water drinking, $F(1,30)=15.38$, $p=0.0029$; Bonferroni post-test, $*p<0.05$, $**p<0.01$. **(D)** Systemic naloxone (1 mg/kg) did not prevent the analgesic effect of conditioned water drinking. Two-way ANOVA: Effect of naloxone, $F(1,10)=2.79$, $p=0.1257$; Effect of water, $F(1,10)=39.86$, $p=0.0002$; Bonferroni post-test, $*p<0.05$, $**p<0.01$.

Figure 7.

Sucrose analgesia in trained rats is dependent on endogenous activation of cannabinoid CB1 receptors. **(A)** CB1 receptor antagonist SR141716A (5 mg/kg, i.p.) increased the latency to start drinking sucrose. Sucrose trained animals were divided randomly into two groups. Each group received either the antagonist or vehicle and received the alternate injection two days later ($p=0.0004$, paired t test, $t=6.951$; $n=7$ rats). **(B)** Passive consumption of sucrose in naïve rats has no effect on thermal nociception. Naïve rats had an intra-oral catheter implanted under anaesthesia and then recovered for 1 h before Hargreaves' testing. Thermal withdrawal latencies were tested during oral

1
2
3
4
5 perfusion of water, sucrose (10%) or air (sham) at 2 μ l/s. Bars represent mean \pm SEM.
6
7 Repeat measures one-way ANOVA, $F(2, 17)=0.7544$, $p=0.4953$; $n=6$ rats, with
8 Bonferroni post-test for multiple comparisons. *ns*, not significant. (C) Sucrose-trained,
9 chronically cannulated rats provided sucrose or water via intraoral cannula for the first
10 time. Thermal withdrawal latencies were tested during oral perfusion of water, sucrose
11 (10%) or air (sham) at 15 μ l/s. $p=0.1494$, repeat measures one-way ANOVA $F(2$
12 $23)=2.184$, $n=8$ rats, with Bonferroni post-test for multiple comparisons, *ns*, not
13 significant. (D) Sucrose-trained, chronically cannulated rats provided sucrose or water
14 via intraoral cannula after five repeat sessions. Thermal paw withdrawal latencies were
15 significantly increased during oral perfusion of sucrose (10%) compared to water or air
16 (sham) at 15 μ l/s. $p=0.001$, repeat measures one-way ANOVA $F(2, 23)=18.04$, $n=8$ rats,
17 with Bonferroni post-test for multiple comparisons, $**p<0.01$ ($t=4.304$), $***p<0.001$
18 ($t=5.781$). (E, F) Effect of CB1 receptor antagonist rimonabant or vehicle treatment on
19 thermal paw withdrawal latencies during perfusion of water or sucrose in cannula
20 experienced rats. (E) Withdrawal latencies were significantly increased during sucrose
21 perfusion compared to water in vehicle-treated animals ($p=0.0066$, paired t-test, $t=3.813$;
22 $n=8$ rats). (F) Rimonabant (5 mg/kg, i.p.) given 15 min prior to testing prevented the
23 increase in latency during sucrose perfusion compared to water ($p=0.9397$, paired t-test,
24 $t=0.0786$; $n=8$ rats).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5 **Movie 1.**
6

7
8 Intra-oral perfusion of sucrose (10% in water; 15 μ l/s) in chronically cannulated rat after
9
10 5 repeat perfusion sessions. Note the movements of the tongue and mouth in the
11
12 without spillage.
13
14

15
16
17 **Movie 2.**
18

19
20 Intra-oral perfusion of water only (15 μ l/s) in chronically cannulated rat after 5 repeat
21
22 perfusion sessions. Note the spillage of the water from the mouth in the absence of
23
24 significant movements of the tongue or the jaw.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Summary (25 words max)

Scientific:

Hedonic drinking induces a potent thermal analgesia mediated supra-spinally by endocannabinoid signalling at CB1 receptors.

Lay:

Drinking sweet beverages suppresses the behavioural response to heat pain due to the release of cannabis-like chemicals in the brain.

Figure 1.




Figure 2.




Figure 3.




Figure 4

Figure 4.




Figure 5

Figure 5.




Figure 6.




Figure 7

Figure 7.

